

Defendant LivaNova PLC does not oppose Plaintiff's request as to Request Nos. 1-7, but does oppose other jurisdictional discovery, including Request Nos. 8-9. (Document No. 40). Defendant contends that Requests Nos. 8-9 are not relevant or tailored to the jurisdictional issues in this case.

After review of the record and the parties' briefs, the undersigned is not persuaded that Defendant should be required to respond to Requests 8-9. Moreover, it is unclear why Plaintiff seeks sixty (60) days for jurisdictional discovery, if that discovery involves review of Defendant's limited document production.

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that "Plaintiff's Motion For Leave To Take Jurisdictional Discovery" (Document No. 36) is **GRANTED, with modification**. Defendant LivaNova PLC shall provide full responses to Plaintiff's "Requests For Production Of Documents" (Document No. 36-3), including Request Nos. 1 through 7, on or before **June 16, 2017**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff shall file a supplement to his opposition to the pending motion to dismiss, or a motion to amend the complaint, on or before **July 7, 2017**.

SO ORDERED.

Signed: May 26, 2017



David C. Keesler
United States Magistrate Judge

